

REMARKS

In the present Amendment, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the phenol compound contains at least one phenolic hydroxyl group. It is clear from the present specification, in particular, the specific examples on pages 32-37, that the phenol compound in the present invention contains at least one phenolic hydroxyl group.

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 7-10 have been amended to improve their format and/or for clarity.


No new matter has been added and entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 1-14 will be all the claims pending in the application.

I. Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In Paragraph No. 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Shiota et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,190,833).

Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are novel and patentable over Shiota et al for at least the following reasons.

Shiota et al describes in Example 4, which is relied upon by the Examiner, a composition comprising a phenol novolak resin (A2), hexamethoxymethylmelamine (B1), 1,4-bis[(3-ethyl-3-oxetanylmethoxy)methyl]benzene (C4) and 2,4-trichloromethyl-(4'-methoxystyryl)-6-triazine (D2) in 3-methoxymethyl propionate (MMP). The structure of C4 is shown below:



C4

Applicants respectfully submit that C4 of Shiota et al does not meet the requirements of component B-1 of the present invention. In particular, the present claims recite as component (B-1), a phenol compound containing at least one phenolic hydroxyl group. In contrast, component C4 of Shiota et al does not have any phenolic hydroxyl groups. Further, Shiota et al does not suggest the use of a phenol compound containing at least one phenolic hydroxyl group.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Shiota et al and thus the rejection should be withdrawn.

II. Response to Claim Objection

In Paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 4 and 7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 1, from which claims 4 and 7 depend, primarily or secondarily, has been overcome as set forth above, and thus, the objection should be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Fang Liu
Registration No. 51,283

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 15, 2005